



Internal Reviews

Performance Period July 2003-September 2003

Introduction

The second year of implementation of Internal Reviews was launched during October 2003 following the summer break for school complexes. The Departments used the months preceding the October implementation to prepare for the upcoming year. As described in the last Integrated Performance Monitoring Report (April 2003-June 2003), the Departments had established objectives that would refine the Internal Review processes in the following areas:

- 1) Ensure community participation in the Internal Review process,
- 2) Redefine the role of mentors including in the rating of cases,
- 3) Improve training and skills of participants in critical discernment and objectivity in conducting reviews,
- 4) Provide guidelines in writing case narratives,
- 5) Clarify the parameters of improvement/corrective action plans, and refine the state-level review process of plans,
- 6) Distribute protocol refinements through trainings,
- 7) Strengthen the Internal Review debriefing process,
- 8) Describe the review sampling methodology,
- 9) Define the Early Intervention Section personnel involvement in focus groups,
- 10) Redesign the verification process, and
- 11) Communicate the commitments of the State and the overall importance of the Internal Review process as a key component of the Statewide Quality Assurance (QA) system for children with special needs

Internal Review Requirements Clarified to the Field

During the First quarter of the fiscal year, key activities were implemented to support progress on the refinement process. In September, a memorandum from the Assistant Superintendent was issued entitled, "Refinements to the Continuous Integrated Monitoring and Improvement Process" (Attachment A). The purpose of the memorandum was to address a number of objectives including clarification of expectations regarding the sample size, community participation, debriefing, the Internal Review Report, and Early Intervention participation in focus groups.

Training Improvements

During September and October, Internal Review Training was held in nineteen Complexes, with the remaining complexes scheduled through March 2004. Training of Complexes was adjusted to allow participants to refine rating discernment skills and emphasize the importance of objectivity in conducting reviews. The ability to critically discern acceptable child status and practice patterns is a vital component of performance reviews. Participants were also trained on new guidelines for writing case narratives.

Agreement Checks

The process used to verify Internal Review findings was evaluated during the Internal Review Retreat held in June 2003. Verification Checks had been employed to validate findings during the first year of implementation through a methodology involving a second review of selected records and interviews by an independent reviewer.

Based upon a full evaluation of the Verification Check process, a decision was made to move to an Agreement Check system that would more effectively provide field-based quality controls for reviewer performance and consistency of ratings. The Agreement Check is an inter-rater reliability tool that was developed through the Felix Monitoring Project to train Service Testing reviewers and deem them capable of conducting independent review work. It involves focused feedback between the experienced and novice reviewer, permitting continued support to complex personnel implementing Internal Reviews.

The work in conducting Service Testing and case-based reviews over the past decade in Hawaii has produced a skilled cohort of experienced reviewers. This has allowed the assignment of an experienced “Mentor,” paired with a lead reviewer from the complex, for each of the cases that will be reviewed during the 2003-2004 school year. Complexes have been informed that the scoring of the Mentors will be applied for this year’s Internal Reviews. Should differing determinations in overall results of a specific review arise between the lead reviewer and the Mentor, the review team can access a “case judge” who will examine the data. Mentors attended a daylong training on September 24, 2003 to launch the Agreement Check process (Attachment B).

The Agreement Check methodology was selected for its value as an effective on-site approach to assure the validity of review findings, and train staff in the complexes. The model should provide controls for the integrity of the review process, and further build statewide capacity for maintaining the practice of Internal Reviews. These are essential factors for sustaining Hawaii’s system for assuring the quality of services for children and youth with special needs.

Integration of Internal Review Findings into Statewide QA System

Findings of each Internal Review, per the guidelines for “Peer Review and Quality Assurance Practices,” are systematically discussed at local level Quality Assurance Meetings as part of a core data tracked by the QA team. As discussed in the Introduction of this report, teams are moving toward using data to inform needed improvements, but have variable capacity in this area. Training and oversight for consistent QA practices that function through continuous quality review and measurement of system interventions are needed to assure these practices are occurring with each QA team. Continued agreements and strategies to strengthen the interagency quality management structures are needed to assure the maintenance of the system.

Preliminary Findings for Reviews Conducted in October

Internal Reviews were conducted in eight complexes in the month of October. Because the reviews were recently conducted, only preliminary results are discussed here. Normally, these results would be a component of the next quarterly report scheduled for release in January 2004, but because of the interest in the results for the complexes, they

are presented in this quarter's report. More detailed demographics and analysis will be presented in the next quarterly report as scheduled.

Of the eight complexes that conducted Internal Reviews in October, six are beginning their second year of implementation. The six complexes are Central Kauai (Kapaa), Farrington, Nanakuli, Hilo/Lapahoehoe, Kahuku, and Pahoa. Two complexes, Waianae and Lanai, are implementing Internal Reviews for the first time following completion of Service Testing conducted through the Felix Monitoring Project. The results for the complexes are displayed below in Table 1. The detailed outcome information for child status and system performance is displayed in Tables 2-9. As displayed, all complexes met the performance target of 85% or better in System Performance. Based on this data, 100% of complexes statewide are performing at an acceptable level in Internal Reviews.

Table 1. Internal Review Results for October 2003

Complex	Date	Sample Size	Child Status SY 2003-2004	System Performance SY 2003-2004	Child Status SY 2002-2003	System Performance SY 2002-2003
Central Kauai	October 13-15, 17, 2003	13	100%	100%	93%	79%
Farrington	October 14-24, 2003	19	100%	100%	100%	78%
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	October 20-24, 2003	18	89%	94%	100%	78%
Nanakuli	October 20-24, 2003	12	83%	92%	64%	64%
Kahuku	October 27-30, 2003	13	100%	100%	100%	83%
Lanai	October 27-31, 2003	12	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
Pahoa	October 27-31, 2003	13	85%	92%	100%	69%
Waianae	October 27-31, 2003	21	91%	86%	N/A	N/A

Table 2. Central Kauai Complex

CENTRAL KAUAI COMPLEX
SY '03-'04: 13 SY '02-'03: 14

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 100% (n=13) SY '02-'03: 79% (n=11)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)	SY '03-'04: 100% (n=13) SY '02-'03: 79% (n=11)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 14% (n=2)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 7% (n=1)	

SY '03-'04: 100% (n=13)
SY '02-'03: 93% (n=13)

Table 3. Farrington Complex

FARRINGTON COMPLEX

SY '03-'04: 19

SY '02-'03: 18

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 100% (n=19) SY '02-'03: 78% (n=14)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)	SY '03-'04: 100% (n=19)	SY '02-'03: 78% (n=14)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 22% (n=4)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)		

SY '03-'04: 100% (n=19)

SY '02-'03: 100% (n=18)

Table 4. Hilo/Laupahoehoe Complex

HILO/LAUPAHOEHOE COMPLEX

SY '03-'04: 18

SY '02-'03: 18

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 83% (n=15) SY '02-'03: 78% (n=14)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 11% (n=2) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)	SY '03-'04: 94% (n=17)	SY '02-'03: 78% (n=14)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 6% (n=1) SY '02-'03: 22% (n=4)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)		

SY '03-'04: 89% (n=16)

SY '02-'03: 100% (n=18)

Table 5. Nanakuli Complex

NANAKULI COMPLEX			
SY '03-'04: 12		SY '02-'03: 11	
Test Outcome 1:	Test Outcome 2:		
+ Child + System Performance	- Child + System Performance	SY '03-'04: 92% (n=11)	SY '02-'03: 64% (n=7)
SY '03-'04: 83.3% (n=10) SY '02-'03: 55% (n=6)	SY '03-'04: 8.3% (n=1) SY '02-'03: 9% (n=1)		
Test Outcome 3:	Test Outcome 4:		
+ Child - System Performance	- Child - System Performance		
SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 9% (n=1)	SY '03-'04: 8.3% (n=1) SY '02-'03: 27% (n=3)		
SY '03-'04: 83% (n=10) SY '02-'03: 64% (n=7)			

Table 6. Kahuku Complex

KAHUKU COMPLEX			
SY '03-'04: 13		SY '02-'03: 12	
Test Outcome 1:	Test Outcome 2:		
+ Child + System Performance	- Child + System Performance	SY '03-'04: 100% (n=13)	SY '02-'03: 83% (n=10)
SY '03-'04: 100% (n=13) SY '02-'03: 83% (n=10)	SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)		
Test Outcome 3:	Test Outcome 4:		
+ Child - System Performance	- Child - System Performance		
SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 17% (n=2)	SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)		
SY '03-'04: 100% (n=13) SY '02-'03: 100% (n=12)			

Table 7. Lanai Complex

LANAI COMPLEX
SY '03-'04: 12

<p>Test Outcome 1:</p> <p>+ Child + System Performance</p> <p>SY '03-'04: 100% (n=12)</p>	<p>Test Outcome 2:</p> <p>- Child + System Performance</p> <p>SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0)</p>	<p>SY '03-'04: 100% (n=12)</p>
<p>Test Outcome 3:</p> <p>+ Child - System Performance</p> <p>SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0)</p>	<p>Test Outcome 4:</p> <p>- Child - System Performance</p> <p>SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0)</p>	
<p>SY '03-'04: 100% (n=12)</p>		

Table 8. Paho Complex

PAHOA COMPLEX
SY '03-'04: 13

SY '02-'03: 13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 77% (n=10) SY '02-'03: 69% (n=9)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 15% (n=2) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)	SY '03-'04: 92% (n=12)	SY '02-'03: 69% (n=9)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 8% (n=1) SY '02-'03: 31% (n=4)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0) SY '02-'03: 0% (n=0)		
SY '03-'04: 85% (n=11) SY '02-'03: 100% (n=13)			

Table 9. Waianae Complex

WAIANAЕ COMPLEX
SY '03-'04: 21

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 86% (n=18)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance SY '03-'04: 0% (n=0)	SY '03-'04: 86% (n=18)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 5% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance SY '03-'04: 9% (n=2)	

SY '03-'04: 91% (n=19)

Summary

Based on these initial scores from the Internal Reviews conducted in October 2003, every complex in the state is demonstrating that youth with special needs are consistently receiving services that are well coordinated, well implemented, and are producing positive results. Further, the vast majority of these youth are doing well across indicators of child well-being. Six of the eight complexes implemented corrective action plans over the past year, and their performance in October's Internal Reviews indicate improvement strategies have been successful. Waianae and Lanai complexes have transitioned from Service Testing conducted by the Courts, to internally driven performance monitoring.

The Internal Review Process continues to be a viable and important methodology for the state in continuing the substantive gains made for youth over the past decade. The state's integrated accountability system remains critical to the commitment for sustainable continuous improvements and outcomes for youth and their families. Because of the value of Internal Reviews in realizing and maintaining positive results, the Departments have internalized these processes into their performance management systems, and remain committed to continued implementation of Internal Reviews in the years to come.